

### REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 18, 2007. Claims 1-13 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 7 and 13 are in independent form, and have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Claims 14 and 15 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and will not be mentioned further. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The remaining independent claims have been amended to clarify the configuration for acquiring management information from a network device, and to make clear that the network device is specified by link information extracted by the extracting means (in Claim 1, see above, or in the extraction step in Claim 7 or Claim 13), and the management information is acquired from the network device that is specified by the mentioned link information. Applicant submits that the claims conform fully with the requirements of Section 112, and therefore respectfully requests that the rejection under that section be withdrawn.

Also, in the Office Action, Claims 1-13 were provisionally rejected over Claims 14-20 of divisional application No. 11/330,097. Since that rejection is only provisional, and the claims on which it is based have not been allowed, Applicant merely notes the rejection at this time.

In addition, Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-13 were rejected for obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 1-98 of U.S. Patent 6,308,205 B1 (Carcerano et al.), and Claims 2 and 8, for double-patenting over those claims in view of U.S. Patent 7,028,081

B2 (Kawashima). Also, Claims 1-13 were rejected for obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 1-28 of *Kawashima*.

Initially, the rejection of Claims 2 and 8 over Claims 1-98 of *Carcerano* in view of *Kawashima* is respectfully traversed. It is noted that the latter common-assigned patent is available as prior art only under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and therefore can be applied as prior art only to show anticipation, and not to show obviousness. 35 U.S.C. § 103(c). Since that patent is being used in this rejection to show that Claims 2 and 8 are merely obvious variants over the subject matter of Claims 1-98 of *Carcerano*, *Kawashima* is improperly being used as a reference to show obviousness. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to a network device managing apparatus for monitoring and managing a network device based on processing first display information of the device and second display information linked from the first display information. The claimed apparatus comprises extracting means for extracting link information embedded in the first display information, and means for receiving an instruction to be used for displaying information based on the second display information corresponding to the link information extracted by said extracting means. Also provided are means for specifying management information of the network device by using template data which describe a plurality of pieces of management information required to display the second display information, and means for acquiring, from the network device specified by the link information extracted by said extracting means, the plurality of pieces of management information specified by the specifying means before the receiving means receive the instruction to display the second display information. The apparatus is also

provided with means for generating output information corresponding to the second display information to prepare for displaying the acquired management information of the network device in a web page of a predetermined form based on the received instruction, and means for transferring, to a predetermined communication link, the output information generated by the generating means. (Certain important aspects of these features are exemplified in Figure 5.)<sup>1/</sup>

In view of at least extraction of link information embedded in the first display information, the template data for specifying the plurality of management information of the network device, and the acquisition of the plurality of pieces of management information from the network device specified by the link information, it is believed that Claim 1 is not merely an obvious variant of the subject matter of any of the claims of either *Carcerano* or *Kawashima*. Claims 7 and 13 contain corresponding recitations, and therefore withdrawal of these double-patenting rejections of all the pending claims also is respectfully requested.

Also, in the Office Action, Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patents 5,987,513 (Prithviraj et al.) and 6,145,001 (Scholl et al.), taken in combination.

*Prithviraj* relates to a system for constructing hypertext documents that can be used to implement management of a network component (hardware or software), even in a complex network that contains components from many different manufacturers. As part of this, the *Prithviraj* configuration acquires the IP address of a network device and

---

<sup>1/</sup> It is of course to be understood that the claim scope is not limited by the details of this or any other particular embodiment that may be referred to.

displays the IP address of the network device in a home page. However, nothing has been found in *Prithviraj* that would disclose or suggest specifying management information of the network device by using template data and acquiring a plurality of pieces of management information from a network device specified by link information, as recited in Claim 1. For at least this reason, it is believed to be clear that Claim 1 is allowable over *Prithviraj* taken alone (and from the Office Action it is understood that the Examiner agrees with this conclusion).

*Scholl* relates to use of a Management Information Base (MIB) containing databases of information related to managed networks and information related to a network management gateway (Fig. 4). In Fig. 6, *Scholl* illustrates the processing of a user request for information. If the request does not relate to a managed network, or if it does and the information is available in a database, then it is retrieved from that database. Otherwise, the request is transmitted to the managed network (step 27), and information is received from that network in reply, which information may optionally be stored in the local database (step 28). The information is converted into html and is forwarded to the user's web client (step 30). Again, nothing has been found in *Scholl* that would teach or suggest extraction of link information embedded in the first display information, the template data for specifying the plurality of management information of the network device, and the acquisition of the plurality of pieces of management information from the network device specified by the link information, as recited in Claim 1. Moreover, even if *Scholl* is combined with *Prithviraj* (and assuming that such combination would be a proper one), Applicant does not see how those features would be found in the result of

such combination. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is allowable over those two patents, taken separately or in any permissible combination.

Independent Claims 7 and 13 are method and program claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or the other of Claims 1 and 7, and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/

Leonard P. Diana  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 629569v1